

Beginning of  
Jesus' conception of his messiahship

This title was preceded by  
The relation of the mystical to the moral in religious  
experience  
The centrality of the value concept in Christian  
thought  
A study of the religious consciousness

And is continued by  
The conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees

Search by above titles on [archive.org](https://archive.org) to  
continue reading this collection of Pacific  
School of Religion Theses from 1934  
call number Thesis Cage 1934 v.5

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2025 with funding from  
Graduate Theological Union

JESUS' CONCEPTION OF HIS MESSIAHSHIP

BY

Bertrande Elijah Weeks

B.A. College of the Pacific 1929

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

IN THE

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

1934









## Analysis : Jesus' Conception of His Messiahship.

### Introduction.

1. What was his conception?	1
2. Opposing views.	2
a. Wrede	2
b. Schweitzer	2
c. Is the Kingdom to evolutionary or catastrophic?	2
d. Rutherfordites.	3
e. Pre-millennialists, Adventists, post-millennialists.	3
3. The centrality and importance of the question.	3

### Chapter I The way to approach the problem.

I. Non-valid methods.	5
a. Harmonization of the Gospels.	5
b. Spiritualization of Gospel teachings.	5
c. Positing of a theory, doctrine or theology.	6
d. Popular and uncritical lives of Jesus.	6
II. A valid method.	
a. A view of his life from the critical-historical perspective.	7
1. Portraits of Jesus based on trustworthy oral tradition.	8
2. Form criticism substantiates above statement.	8
b. Understanding an individual.	8
1. The necessity of a knowledge of the background.	9
2. Our scientific background makes it hard for us to understand ancient Jewish ideas.	9





## Chapter II. Hebrew and Jewish background.

### A. National religious eschatology.

#### I. Early popular conceptions of the day of Yahweh. 11

##### a. The ancient covenant. 11

###### (1) National hope involved two ideas. 11

(a) Yahweh in person should come to vindicate himself  
and Hebrews. 12

(b) A new era of continuous material prosperity. 12

###### (2) Two stages of the popular conceptions of the day of Yahweh. 13

(a) Earlier form. 13

(b) Second stage reflected in Nahum and Habakkuk. 13

#### II. The prophetic conception of the Day of Yahweh. 13

##### a. In direct contrast with popular conception. 14

(1) Catastrophe in society not in nation. 14

(2) Catastrophe not supernatural but historical. 14

(3) Origin of 'Signs' of the end of the world. 14f

b. Day of Judgment would be a vindication of Yahweh's Righteous-  
ness. 15

##### c. Stages of this conception. 15

(1) Day of Judgment directed against Israel. 15

(2) Day of Judgment directed against Judah. 15f

(3) Day of Judgment directed against the whole world. 16

d. As yet no conception of a Messiah appears. 16

### III. Exilic and post-exilic conceptions.

Derivation of our term "Messiah". 16

A. During the exilic and post-exilic periods they had no king.

(1) Under Jeremiah and Isaiah the Day of Yahweh takes an  
inward spiritual significance. 17



(2) Several stages of this belief.	17
(a) Davidic King.	17
(b) Cyrus, acting as the annointed.	17
(c) The Suffering Servant of St. Isaiah.	17
(3) Two schools of thought during this period.	
(a) Particularistic.	17f
(b) Universalistic.	18
(4) The Levitic conception.	18
(a) Seeming success of the Macabees turns to failure.	
(5) The rapid development of apocalypticism.	18
(a) Based on despair.	
(b) Daniel 7:13,14.	19
(c) Similitudes of Enoch.	19
(d) Contrast between these 'Son of Man' concepts and	20
the Levitic, Davidic, and early prophetic conceptions.	
IV. The character of the New Age and the Messiah.	
A. Leading views.	21
1. External duration on the present earth.	21
2. Temporary duration on the present earth.	21
3. External duration in a new heaven and new earth.	21
B. Four views of the Messiah in apocalyptic literature.	21f
1. No appearance.	22
2. From the tribe of Levi.	22
3. Judah again claims Davidic Messiah.	22
4. Enoch's 'Son of Man'.	22
C. Summary.	22f



### Chapter III. Hebrew-Jewish background continued.

A. International conditions.	24
1. Mathews, Shailer, History of N.T. Times in Palestine.	24
2. Continuous change of rulers.	24
3. Persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes arouse Maccabees revolt.	24
4. Jewish aloofness from other people and their culture.	25
5. Continuous wars, killing of people in uprisings, heavy taxes	25
and other internal difficulties lead to a hatred of the Romans.	
B. Internal group differences.	25
1. Economic, social, political, and religious unrest.	25
(a) Essenes	25
(b) Sadducees	25
(c) Pharisees	25
(d) Scribes	25
(e) Zealots	25
(f) Zadokites	26
2. These internal quarrels, the international situation, plus	
the repeated failure of the prophecies of the end of the age	
led to despair.	26
C. Apocalypticism thrived on the above misfortunes.	
1. Continuous disappointment revealed in their history.	26
2. Ezekiel turns that thought away from Prophetic Messianism.	26
3. Pharisaic substitution of legalism for prophetic righteousness.	26
4. Apocalypticism arose in lower middle and under classes.	27

### Chapter IV. Source Materials.

I. Paul's contributions.	28
II. The Gospel of John.	28
III. Types of material in the Synoptic Gospels.	





1. Eschatological passages.	28
a. Meaning of the word eschatology.	28
2. Rapid summary of background out of which the Son of Man Messianic concept developed.	29
A. New Testament references in which Jesus speaks of himself coming back on the clouds of heaven.	29
1. Scholars not agreed as to how to interpret these passages.	30
2. Understanding gained thru historical appreciation.	30f
3. Synoptic citations.	31f
4. THESE represent the world-view of their day.	32
B. Additions to Jesus eschatology.	34
1. Saying "Lord, Lord"	34
2. Parable of the tares and the net.	34
3. Marcan apocalypse.	34f
4. Eschatological sayings changed to historical predictions.	35
a. Saying in regard to Jerusalem.	35
b. Luke's rendition of Mk 13.	35
C. Assured eschatological materials.	
1. Kingdom eschatological in origin.	35f
2. Relation between Jesus and Kingdom.	36
3. His coming again.	36
4. Eschatological material in Q.	37
5. Impression made by these passages.	37
6. Spiritualizing tendency in modern theology.	37f
7. Jesus' intentions.	38
8. Significance of eschatology for Jesus.	39



D. Transmitted eschatology.	39
1. Kingdom present.	39
a. Parables Mk 3:24-27.	39
b. Addressing Pharisees.	39f
(1) Bundy	40
(2) Goguel	40
c. Time of Jesus' opposition to John.	41
d. As a little child.	41
e. Parables of mustard seed and leaven.	41
2. Religion as present social spiritual experience.	41
a. John the Baptist question. Temptation experience.	41
b. His disciples understood him.	42
c. Fulfillment of Messianic expectancies.	42
d. Summary.	43
e. Comparison.	44
E. Non-eschatological materials.	44
1. Citations.	44
2. Doublets.	44
3. Issue with consistent eschatology.	45

## Chapter V. Jesus' use of Apocalypticism and Eschatology.

I. Misunderstanding of these sections.	46
A. Non-historical approach.	46
B. Use by 'isms'.	46
II. A. General conception of Philosophy of history of Hebrews.	46f
B. Closing of the cannon.	47
C. Apocalyptic writings only expression of discontent.	47
D. Apocalypticism retrogressive, but their world view.	47





### III. Social situation.

- A. Indifference of Scribes and Pharisees. 48
- B. Activity of Zealots. 48
- C. Jesus sees need of action. 48

### IV. Jesus neither orthodox nor apocalyptic exclusively.

- A. Adopts apocalyptic eschatology. 48f
- B. Various ways in which he changes its content. 49

### V. Summary of Jesus use of the apocalyptic-eschatology. 50f

## Chapter VI. Jesus' use of the term 'Son of Man'

### I. Jesus' message. 56

- A. What did he mean? 56
- B. What people expected. 56
- C. Things he rejected. 56f

### II. Did 'Son of Man' have meaning in his day?

- A. Dalman. 57
- B. Charles, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. 57
- C. Various views about Jesus' conception of the Messiahship.
  - 1. Case. 57
  - 2. Patton. 58
  - 3. Branscomb. 58
  - 4. Bundy 58
  - 5. Denny. 58f
  - 6. Goguel. 59
  - 7. Modernization of Jesus. 60
  - 8. Bacon. 60
  - 9. Scott. 60
  - 10. Schweitzer. 60



D. Why shouldn't Jesus claim the Messiahship?	61
1. Jesus' use of the Son of Man as best available title.	61
2. Advantages of the title, Son of Man.	62
3. He puts new content into it.	62
4. The title as definitive of the method of his work.	63
5. Jesus' self-consciousness.	64
6. Apocalyptic language expresses his self-consciousness.	65
E. Jesus puts new content into this title as well as into apocalyptic-eschatology.	65f



## JESUS' CONCEPTION OF THE MESSIAHSHIP

### Introduction

What was Jesus' conception of the Messiahship? The reason why the answer to this problem is of immediate and extreme importance to the world of today lies in the fact that there are many competing present-day conceptions of the meaning of the messiahship of Jesus, each one of which is leading the energies and life of the followers of Jesus in different directions. Thus instead of Jesus heading one solid, strong movement, he is at the head of a house that is severely divided against itself. It is very safe to say that Jesus did not hold all of these conceptions. It is a probability that none of them is entirely true, and it is doubtless true that one or more of them come closer to Jesus' real position than many of the others.

As Schweitzer has stated, we are dealing with the most vital thing in the world's history in the study of the messiahship of Jesus. 'There came a man to rule over the world; he ruled it for good and for ill, as history testifies; he destroyed the world into which he was born; the spiritual life of our own times seems like to perish at his hands, for he leads to battle against our thought a host of dead ideas, a ghostly army upon which death has no power, and himself destroys again the truth and goodness which His spirit creates in us, so that it cannot rule the world. That he continues notwithstanding to reign as the alone Great and alone True in a world of which he denied the continuance, is the prime example of that antithesis between spiritual and natural truth which underlies all life and all events, and in him emerges into the





field of history.<sup>1</sup>

Instead of being united, different schools of scholars have arrived at wide and contradictory extremes in considering the question of the meaning of Jesus' own conception of his messiahship.

Wrede, one of Germany's liberal scholars, came to the conclusion that Jesus never regarded himself as the messiah. Jesus was a Jewish prophet who went to the cross for fidelity to his message. After his death Jesus' disciples read back into his life and teachings the theory of messiahship that we find in our New Testament.<sup>2</sup>

The other classic example that many authors quote is the eminent Dr. Schweitzer of Germany, who came to just exactly the opposite conclusion. Schweitzer maintains that we must interpret the life and teachings of Jesus on the basis of eschatology. To him Jesus was a man of his own times, and he used the language of his own times. Therefore we must keep the gospels practically intact. Jesus fully shared the ideas of the apocalyptic writers of his day as to the imminent end of the present age. When he spoke of the coming kingdom he meant a catastrophic destruction of the world or a cataclysmic ending of the present age, and a supernatural inauguration of a new age of God's will on a reconstituted earth. Thus the gospels must be taken literally, Jesus was the Messiah in the transcendental supernaturalistic sense. He meant to establish the kingdom of God by returning on the clouds of the heavens to judge the world.<sup>3</sup>

Out of these two extremes has come the question, how did

---

1. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historic Jesus, p. 2
2. Taylor, Formation of Gospel Tradition, p. 80
3. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historic Jesus, Eschatology.



Jesus conceive of his connection with the coming of the Kingdom? Was it to come about through catastrophe or through other means? The answer of these questions is extremely important for the message of his church in these times. In other words, can the world be saved by the preaching of gospel, the doctrines of a righteous and loving God, of the sacrificial love of Jesus the Christ filled man, and man's relation to his fellow man as a brother? Or must there be a catastrophic change to result in a 'golden age' of the future where men may dwell in righteousness, peace, and plenty?

Are the Rutherfordites and the other sects right in saying that the second coming has already taken place -- that the spiritual Christ has already appeared in human flesh?

Are the pre-millennialists, Adventists, and others, right when they say that all human schemes and endeavor toward reconstruction are of no consequence; that the transformation will take place in an external catastrophe upon the coming of Christ; that the world is continually getting worse; that our task is to relieve distress, save souls, and join the fellowship of the few believers in whose hearts Christ reigns, and who are patiently waiting for his return?

Are the post-millennialists right in saying that the preaching of the gospel under the influence of God's spirit is gradually converting the world, and that when all have heard, Christ will come and the judgment take place?

It is important for us to know whether or not the teachings of Jesus give us a real basis for the belief that God plans suddenly to end the life and affairs of the planet by a great catastrophe. As Dr. McCown





has stated, 'Every question, theoretical and practical, with which modern Christianity is concerned must be answered according to our understanding of Jesus' conception of the messiahship and the second coming.'<sup>1</sup>

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 29.



## Chapter I. The Way to Approach the Problem

### A. Non-valid Methods

Many non-valid attempts to explain our problem have been made. One of these is the harmonizing method where all the materials of the four gospels are put together in a fearfully and wonderfully made harmonistic whole. Materials from all gospels are considered to be of equal value. When difficulties in harmonizing are faced, either the lesser of two evils, or a posited theory or theology determines what shall be used and what shall not. This method is completely uncritical and subject to the additions and changes that the gospel writers and copyists have made in addition to Jesus' real teachings. The following are examples:

Stalker, The Christology of Jesus. P. 136. In discussing the task of the Messiah as the ruler of the kingdom, at the bottom of the page in a footnote, Stalker accepts the evidence of the synoptics and of John's gospel as of equal value.

In his Ethics of Jesus, see pp. 24, 46, 49 for the same characteristic.

Another method which has been used is that of spiritualizing the teachings, making Jesus independent of the thought forms of his time. By the use of allegory, one may make the Bible teach almost anything he desires. This way of interpreting theapocalyptic and eschatological passages of the synoptics has often been used in trying to get away from the abuse which they have received at the hands of many modern cults, the pre-millennialists, and the post-millennialists. The predicting of a definite date for the coming of the end of the world is one such abuse from which common sense shrank. For examples of the spiritualizing



tendency we may turn to

The Life of Christ in Recent Research, p. 56. "It will be seen ..... that everything is thrown into the future.

The moral teachings that we get in the gospels are not so much the ethics of the Kingdom as ethical teachings fit for the Kingdom,"

This quotation spiritualises both the Kingdom and the Messiah.

Also p. 115. "What is the essential meaning of the Kingdom of God? Is it not the asserted and realized sovereignty of God, Divine influence and Divine power felt as energizing the souls of men?"

See also the IOC Matthew, the interpretation of the triumphal entry by Allen, and Schleiermacher and the whole school that followed him. Christian Science literature is another example.

Another non-valid method is to start with a posited theory, doctrine, or theology, and accept only the teachings that fit the theory, doctrine, or theology by very conveniently 'passing by on the other side' of those that disagree. By paying attention to only those verses which one chooses to explain one's theology and neglecting those that do not fit into one's scheme, it is very easy to work up a seemingly plausible scriptural background. The main trouble with this method is that the range of experience recorded in the Bible is so wide that one might prove practically anything he desired, especially by taking verse or phrases out of their context. For examples of those who start with a posited theory, doctrine, or theology we may refer to

Denny, The Career and Significance of Jesus, The central idea of this book is that, "Jesus was the Son of God, not in an apocalyptic





or even a Messianic sense, but in the deep religious sense that he knew God as his heavenly Father, and felt that the supreme end of life was to live in a manner worthy of such a Father." p. xiii of the Introduction.

Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 328ff.

McCown, The Promise of His Coming , a pre-millennial manifesto signed by R.A. Torrey, G. Campbell Morgan, and other conservative church leaders, "All human schemes of reconstruction must be subsidiary to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

All Pre and Post-millennial literature as well as Adventist literature are good examples.

And then of course those attempts that are built on secondary sources are not valid as they will only pass on interpretations of the original sources, and these interpretations may be faulty. The same objection holds good for popular lives of Jesus. Most popular lives of of Jesus and practically all uncritical lives of Jesus are based on secondary sources.

## B. A Valid Method

As I see it, the correct way to render a valid answer to our question is to go straight to the background from which Jesus came and in which he lived, and with this as a basis for understanding his life and problems, study the original source materials (the synoptic gospels, John's gospel, and Paul's letters), forgetting theories and theologies, to find through textual, source, historical, and form criticism, the actual teachings of Jesus.



After we have weeded out the contributions of the authors, the doctrines of the early Christian Church, and the mistakes of the copyists, through the various branches of criticism, we have several portraits of Jesus and his teachings based on the oral tradition behind the gospels. Schweitzer tells us that the synoptic gospels, (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) only give us a life of Jesus with yawning gaps.<sup>1</sup> That is to say, the gospels are not biographies, but the products of primitive Christian catechetical and evangelistic interests. This, however, does not cast any reflection on the validity of our sources. Quoting Schweitzer again, 'When we have once made up our minds that we have not the materials for a complete life of Jesus; but only for a picture of his public ministry, it must be admitted that there are few characters of antiquity about whom we possess as much indubitably historical information, of whom we have so many authentic discourses. Jesus' position is much more favorable than is that of Socrates, for he is pictured to us by literary men who exercised their creative ability on the portrait. Jesus stands much more immediately before us because he was depicted by simple Christians without much literary gift.'<sup>2</sup>

Form-criticism very adequately backs up these conclusions of literary, source and historical criticism by proclaiming that the gospels are not written in chronological order, and that we cannot accurately construct much of a development in the teachings of Jesus. However, there are some sections, such as the 'passion narratives' and a few other incidents, that are continuous in form.<sup>3</sup>

It is hard to understand an individual unless one knows his background. No literature can be really understood apart from its people

- 
1. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historic Jesus, p. 7
  2. Ibid, p. 6
  3. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, p. 13



and its environment. When Paul condemned women for attending church without their hats, it was chiefly because it was a social custom that only prostitutes appeared on the streets and in public places with uncovered heads. So it is with many other customs of Jesus' day that are foreign to our way of acting. I Cor. 11:10

Jesus was an historical person, not the personification of our highest ideals and moral judgments. We cannot know how he lived or what he taught by consulting our own desires, hopes, or prejudices any more than we could understand Socrates, or Martin Luther by the process of imagination not based on their life sources.<sup>1</sup>

If one were to desire to act the part of Abraham Lincoln in a play he would naturally study the times in which Lincoln lived, with all of its economic, political, national, and religious movements, the problems he had to face, and the way in which he faced his life and problems. Having this information, one could make the portrayal of the character of Lincoln real to an audience. Thus having a knowledge of the background of Jesus, and a critical evaluation of the sources disclosing his teachings in the oral tradition of the primitive communities, we may form our conclusion on Jesus' own conception of his Messiahship.

With our scientific background, we find it hard to conceive of a man using eschatological and apocalyptic ideas, But if Jesus did not use eschatological and apocalyptic language and ideas, we will have to eliminate large and important sections of the synoptic gospels as 'un-authentic interpretations of the early Christians'. 'This would force

---

1. Branscomb, The teachings of Jesus, p. 11





us to believe that Jesus lived and died outside the currents of thought that dominated his contemporaries.' <sup>1</sup> To expect Jesus to set for them his ideas about the messiahship in the literary and scientific terms of our own day is sheer folly.

In the next chapter let us look at him in the surroundings that condition his message.

---

1. McCown, Genesis of the Social Gospel, p. 325



## Chapter II. Hebrew and Jewish Background

### A. History of National Hope and Faith in the Day of Yahweh

First of all let us firmly establish this fact in our minds.

The origin or root of the Messianic idea lies in the national-religious eschatology of the Israelites, or in their belief in the condition of the nation in the Day of Yahweh. Belief in this day is older than written prophecies. (Amos 5:18)

### I. The Early Popular Conceptions of the Day of Yahweh

In the very early days of their history Yahweh had sought them out as a nation to be his people. For being his people Yahweh had promised them a future golden age of a great nation in which they were to dwell in peace and plenty. For many years the golden age did not arrive, but like the Republican party their hope for 'prosperity was always just around the corner'. Their faith that Yahweh would conquer the other gods could not be shaken. Their patriotism was not a question of right or wrong. It was 'my country cannot be wrong -- right will eventually reign in the triumph of the Hebrew nation over all its enemies, and its conquest of all of the lands of the earth'.<sup>1</sup> Practically all of the prophets from the time of Samuel to Amos were friends and confidential advisors of the reigning monarchs. Israel's duty was to serve Yahweh and be blest in turn. Amos in attacking the current conception of the Day of Yahweh (Amos 5:18) says, "Woe unto you that desire the Day of Yahweh! Wherefore would ye have the day of Yahweh. It is darkness not light ...." This shows that belief in the Day of Yahweh was common property among the people to whom Amos was speaking. 'To the popular mind the Day of Yahweh

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 35



meant a time of visitation and vindication when Yahweh would punish Israel's enemies and reveal himself as the mightiest of Gods by making his people the greatest nation.' The foundation of the Hebrew national hope was a firm faith in the inseparable relation between Israel and Yahweh. He was their God, they were his people. For their service Yahweh was to make them a great nation.<sup>1</sup>

The Hebrew national hope involved two ideas: (1) Yahweh in person should come and vindicate himself and the Hebrews, (2) A new era of continuous material prosperity was to follow.

To the popular mind, this day of vindication was to be a great day of battle when Yahweh would place himself at the head of the armies of the Hebrews and lead them to an overwhelming victory over all their enemies. We must remember, however, that at this stage of their history, Yahweh was a nature God who conducted his warfare through the use of volcanoes, fire, earthquake, famine, and pestilence. Judges 5:4f, Amos 1:14, 2:14ff, Micah 1:3f. In other words, this day of vindication would be a day of natural catastrophe which would be world wide as far as the Hebrews' enemies were concerned. All of their warfare would be aided by Yahweh's use of the forces of nature to destroy their enemies. Already we see traces of apocalyptic language.<sup>2</sup>

The basis of the idea of 'a new era of continuous material prosperity' is to be found in the adaption of Babylonian mythology.<sup>3</sup> In Hebrew mythology the primeval monster was only conquered, not killed, and therefore it would be necessary for Yahweh to come and finish his task.<sup>4</sup>

1. Bade, Old Testament in the Light of Today, p. 135

2. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 59

3. Cesterly, Messianic Idea, p. 61, see Isa. 51:9

4. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 50





In the southern kingdom the hope of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty ran competition with the mythology in bringing in this new age. (See Isa. description in courtly language.) In Micah 4:1-4 and Isa. 2:2-4, we have a classic description of the new era of which peace and plenty were characteristic. And this new era was to be brought in either by Yahweh directly or by an earthly king representing him.

There were two stages of this popular conception of the day of Yahweh:

1. The earlier form held by the eighth century contemporaries of Amos as to the nature of the judgment or Israel's enemies.

a. The relation of Yahweh to Israel was natural, religious, and national--not ethical. Amos 3:2.

b. Israel's duty was to worship Yahweh, and he would protect them.

c. As Israelites punctually performed ceremonial duties they might look forward to the speedy coming of the Day of Yahweh.

2. The second stage is reflected by Nahum and Habakkuk. It was to be a judgment against Israel's enemies, but it was to be based on ethical grounds.

a. Since Josiah's reform Israel was righteous in the sight of wicked Gentiles. Hab. 1:4, 13. Hence the judgment will strike not righteous Israel, but the godless Gentiles.

It should be noticed here that Yahweh himself is the or redeemer and the judge of his own people--the figure of the Messiah not yet appearing.

## II The Prophetic Conception of the Day of Yahweh.

The pre-exilic prophetic conception of the day of Yahweh was in



direct contrast to the popular conception. The prophetic language rests upon and utilizes the popular eschatology, but fundamentally alters its application. The prophets made an historical application of the idea in society. To them the Day was not a far off divine event, but an historical fact.

The supreme task of the Prophet is to interpret present events in the light of eternal truth. To the prophets this catastrophe was to come in society, not in nature. The great prophets of Israel strove to bring the people to see the dreadful day of Yahweh impending in the tremendous historical drama that was being played before their eyes, and in which they were unwillingly compelled to be the chief actors. For them the hosts of Yahweh are the armies of Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, and Greece. (See Isa. 5:26-30, 8:6ff, Ezek. 22:30) whose tread shakes the land like an earthquake, and sweeps the land like a flood, in whose wake rises the smoke of burning cities as when Yahweh rained fire on the cities of the plain.<sup>1</sup>

Thus instead of a supernatural mythologically conceived catastrophe in nature having no connection with historical events and expected in the distant future, the prophets thought of it as an economic, political, and social catastrophe growing out of historical circumstances, due to Israel's low moral and religious living, and taking place as an historical event in the near future.<sup>2</sup>

'Out of the attempt to use the old language of cosmic catastrophe and reinterpret it in terms of historical events grows one of the most common ideas of later Jewish and Christian times -- the belief that wars,

---

1. Fuller, Religious Development of the Intertestamental Period p. 2066  
Abingdon Commentary
2. Ibid.



or rumors of wars, and signal disasters of any kind are heralds of the end of the world. Any calamity was a warning to be prepared for the great day of Yahweh, when he would appear to vindicate himself by judging and punishing all unrighteousness. See Amos 4:6-12. The prophets saw Yahweh's ministers of wrath in hostile armies. When hostile armies attacked Israel and prophets cried out warnings, they did not mean the end of the world in the modern conception of the term. It is only by combining the language of world catastrophe which the prophets borrowed from the popular faith with the accepted ideas of divine warnings of impending punishment, as the prophets used it, that we come to the notion that wars, or any calamities, are divine warnings of the end of the world.<sup>1</sup>

To be sure there was to be a day of Judgment but it would be a day when Yahweh vindicates his righteousness. Israel had sinned heavily against Yahweh. Amos 3:2, Isa. 5:1-7. It was for moral, not natural delinquencies that they were to suffer. This wrath was going to fall on Israel as well as on other nations.<sup>2</sup>

Again we have several stages of this conception:

1. The day of Judgment is to be directed mainly against Israel.

In Amos 5:18f, we have a strong protest against the popular and particularistic conception of the day. Amos insists that Yahweh will not vindicate Israelites in their wickedness, but will vindicate his righteousness. Hosea is of one mind with Amos in the irrevocableness of the judgment if Israel does not reform her ways.

2. The second stage is directed mainly against Judah.

a. In Isaiah and Micah the day has a new application. It is directed against Judah, not that warnings against Israel are neglected.

1. McCown, Promise of His Coming, p. 67 and 68

2. (Article) Eschatology--Prophetic--Pre-Exilic Conception, Encyclopedia Biblica





Is. 26:21, 8:1-4

b. However there will be a remenant left. Is. 1:24-26.

c. Micah sees no hope, only utter destruction.

3. In the third stage, the judgment is directed against the whole world. This results in the survival of the righteous element of Israel, Zeph. 1:2f. It deals with the whole earth including Jerusalem, Zeph. 1:8-13, Philistia, Etheopa, and Assyria 2:1-6, all nations 3:8, and with all inhabitants of the earth 1:18.

The instruments of Judgment are a mysterious people, called the guests of Yahweh, 1:7.

Again we come to the close of a period and find that the conception of a Messiah plays no central part. It is Yahweh that judges and redeems.

### III. Exilic and Post-Exilic Conceptions

Perhaps it would be weel to stop here and define the term

from which our word Messiah comes.<sup>1</sup> In Hebrew it means 'the

annointed'. It was commonly used in connection with the kings who were thought to rule only through the grace of Yahweh, and who were annointed with oil at the request of Yahweh before they became kings. At first the term had no messianic content at all. During the exilic and post-exilic periods of Israel's history it begins to be used as the name for the coming ideal king (earthly) who is to free Israel from her bondage, and lead her in her golden age. Sometimes 'the annointed' refers to a line of Davidic kings.

---  
1.  
Jewish Encyclopedia, (Article) "Messiah"



During the exilic and post-exilic periods the people had no king or country, and yet they did not give up their hope of the coming into their own days of glory.

Under the leadership of Jeremiah and Isiah there came a new meaning to the relation of the spiritual to social progress. To them the Day of Yahweh was not outward and mechanical, but inward and spiritual. Jer. 31:31, 33.<sup>1</sup>

#### Several Stages of Belief:

a. The people looked forward to going back to their own country under the leadership of a Davidic king who would restore Israel. Is. 2:1-6, 11:1-8. There was to be a partial or complete destruction of the gentiles. If any remained, they would become the servants of Israel, however, only the wicked would be destroyed.

b. Another stage was that Cyrus, acting as the annointed of Yahweh, would free them and 'collective Israwl' would take the place of the Davidic line of kings. Is. 55:3. Yahweh would be their king and messiah.

c. In another stage the Israelites asked why it should be that the evil nations should continue to punish righteous Israel. Second Isaish came back with the answer that through suffering Yahweh had prepared Israel to be his messenger to the nations. He believed that the Day of Yahweh was past, and that Israel was now purified and ready to enter on her new mission, 40:2, 42:3ff. They were to reign on this earth under Davidic leadership.

It must be noted that there were two schools of thought in this period. (1) The Particularistic which held that the judgment was to

1. Osterly& Robinson, Hebrew Religion, p. 261 ff.



effect only the wicked Hebrews, and all of the gentiles, meaning complete destruction for the gentiles. (2) The Universalistic which held that the judgment would be universal, and that only the wicked of both the Israelites and gentiles should perish while the remainder under the leadership of Israel should set up the kingdom. Also, that the kingdom would either be ruled over by Yahweh himself or by a chosen or annointed human servant.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Levitic Conception:

And then came the independence movement led by the Macabees. Due to the international situation, the Macabees were able to win a semi-political and religious independence. During this period the writings of the twelve Patriarchs, part of the apocalyptic writings, came into circulation, stating that the 'annointed one' or messiah was to come from the tribe of Levi. The Macabees were members of the priestly tribe, and pragmatically they had stood the test by achieving their semi-independence so the messianic popular sentiment went toward Levi, leaving the Davidic kingship entirely out of the picture. But when the international situation changed and Rome could pay a little attention to the Macabees, it was not long until they were past history.

#### Apocalyptic:

Then despair did cloud the sky and all hope seemed to be gone. The hope of ever establishing the Messianic Kingdom on this earth was blown over. This world was too wicked. If the kingdom was to be established, it must be established through intervention from outside. Here we find the

---

1. Oesterly and Robinson, Hebrew Religion, p. 276 ff.









were destroyed before his face. And there will stand up in that day all the kings, and the mighty, and exalted, and those who hold the earth, and they will see and recognize him how he sits on the throne of his glory.'

The above differs radically from the former conception of Messiah as the prince of Redeemed People, by making the Messiah the  $\int \chi / \lambda$  or redeemer instead of Yahweh.

In earlier references to Enoch as 1:3ff, Yahweh is the judge and  $\int \chi / \lambda$ . In 4 Esdras 13:2-13, from Bensleys Latin text we have the description of Messiah 'And behold, from the sea a great wind arose and stirred up all its waves. And I looked, and behold that wind caused to ascend from the heart of the sea as it were the likeness of a man. I looked, and behold this man flew with the clouds of heaven, and whithersoever he turned his face and gazed, there all things trembled when they were seen by him, and whithersoever the voice went forth out of his mouth, then all that heard his voice melted away as wax does when it feels the fire. And after these things I looked and behold a multitude of men that could not be numbered, were gathered together from the four winds of heaven, in order to come against the man who had ascended out of the sea, and I looked and behold he hewed out for himself a great mountain and flew upon it. But I sought to discover the region or locality out of which the mountains had been hewn, but I could not, and after this I looked and behold, all they that were gathered against him in order to fight him were greatly afraid, nevertheless they dared to fight, and behold when he observed the onslaught of the approaching multitude, he raised not his hand, nor did he clutch his sword, nor any other warlike weapon. I only



saw how that he sent forth out of his mouth as it were a fiery stream, and from his lips flaming breath and from his tongue there came out storms of sparks, these were all mixed together, the fire stream, flaming breath, and overwhelming storm, and these struck against the approaching multitude which had prepared to fight, and burned the whole of it so that suddenly nothing was seen of the miserable multitude but dust and ashes, and the smell of smoke, and when I saw this I was terrified, and after this I saw the man descending from the mountain, and calling unto him another, a peaceful multitude, and there was nigh unto him the figures of many men; some joyful, sad, bound, and others led those whom they brought as offerings. <sup>1</sup> The Messianic reign of peace follows this incident.

#### IV The Character of the New Age and the Messiah

With reference to the character of the new age, there are three leading views:

1. It is to be of eternal duration on present earth, 1 Enoch 1:36, 11 Mac.
2. It is to be of temporary duration on this earth, IV Esdras, Ps. Solomon 17f.
3. It is to be of eternal duration with new heaven and new earth, E. Enoch 37:70, Is. 65:17, Zech. 14:6f. <sup>2</sup>

The above and following are taken in the main from Dr. McCown's book "The Promise of His Coming". <sup>2</sup>

Four different views appear about the Messiah in Apocalyptic

---

1. Oesterly, The Messianic Idea
2. McCown, The Promise of His Coming p. 122





literature:

1. In many books he does not appear at all, or plays a very minor role.
2. In the original Testament of Twelve Patriarchs, the Messiah comes from a tribe of Levi.<sup>1</sup>
3. With Maccabean disappointment interpolation was later made in the Testament of Twelve Patriarchs claiming the Messiah for Judah, and David line. This was dominant from and after the first century.<sup>2</sup>
4. In place of human son of David, but divinely ideal and sinless, came the E. Enochian pre-existent heavenly Son of Man, whose title is borrowed from Daniels personification of Israel.<sup>3</sup>

Amongst the people of Jesus' own time, the Sadducees had contempt for everything but prayer and effort directed toward establishing the kingdom here and now. The scribes and pharisees had complete faith in the law, as one of them said, 'If everyone would keep the law for one day, the Kingdom would be here.'

Among the Apocalyptists there were two conceptions as to how the son of man was to come:

1. Come in suffering and humiliation
2. Come in power, glory, and honor.

The above two conceptions seem clearly contradictory.

From our thinking over this question, I hope that we have seen that the Messianic idea began with early Hebrew eschatology, the prophets connected this eschatology with history for moral reformation;

---

1. Charles, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Reut. 6:7-12; Levi 8:14, 18, Jud. 24:1-3, etc.
2. Ibid, Jud. 24:5f
3. Ibid, Enoch. 46:1-3, 48:3-6; 69:27.



the exilic and post-exilic prophets were not agreed, some thinking that the judgment was over, and some that a Davidic King would lead them. The Macabees provided a temporary satisfaction with Levitical theocracy. With the downfall of the Macabees comes apocalypticism with both the this world's kingdom of Yahweh, and the other worldly Messiah who was to redeem Israel. During Jesus' time, the Saducees, Pharisees, and Scribes, Essenes, Zealots, and other sects had different ideas about the Messiahship.



### Chapter III. Hebrew and Jewish Background (Continued)

#### I. International Conditions

Let us take a brief look at the international conditions.

A very splendid treatment of this subject is to be found in Matthew's "History of New Testament Times in Palestine".

The political history of Israel is one of continuous change and turmoil. The rapidity of the change of their rulers is amazing. After Alexander conquered Darius in 333, they managed fairly well until Alexander's death. In 320 Israel was united in Seleucid-Syria satrapy with Samaritans. After Alexander's death Ptolemy Lagus conquered Palestine. Judea prospered under him as their tribute was not too heavy, and they were allowed much freedom in their government. Then the priest Onias II failed to pay the tribute, so the Ptolemy sold Judea to an adventurer by the name of Joseph. Joseph greatly advanced economic class distinction and Hellenization.

Antiochus Epiphanes, the Seleucid, conquered Egypt between 171-68

B. C. He levied heavy taxes and persecuted the religious Jews.

The priest Mattathias killed an officer who was trying to make him, Mattathias, sacrifice to a foreign god. Out of this act came the rise of the Maccabees. Under Judas Maccabees, the Hebrews achieved religious freedom; under Jonathan Nationalism; under Simon consolidation of Judaism; under John Hyrcanus political freedom. But no sooner was this done that the Romans subjected Judea when Pompey captured Jerusalem. Then internal troubles in Rome forced heavy taxes, and frequent change of rulers on the Jews.





Religiously the Jews held themselves apart from other people and their culture. This caused them to be suspicioned and ill treated in many ways.

The continuous wars and subjections to first one and then another authority, with the gaining and losing of freedom and the constant killing off of the Jewish people led them to an intense hatred of their Roman rulers. It also quickened the apocalyptic messianic hopes.

## II Internal Group Differences

To make matters worse there was economic, social, political, and religious discension amongst their own family.

The Essenes were aescetic and philosophical, and would have nothing to do with the pressing problems. Their solution was to retire to simple life, or in other words, to ignore all difficulties.

The Sadducees were 'traitorous opportunists', the aristocratic politicians and ruling class. They were like the class of people who are well entrenched and have special privileges in our own nation. As long as they obtained a comfortable living they were satisfied to compromise with the culture and ways of Rome, even if it meant the suffering of the great majority of their fellowmen.

The Pharisees were doctrinaire indifferentists, who studied the scriptures and kept the law. They were small in number, but very influential. They were the religious leaders of the people and apocalyptic to a large extent than many groups.

The Scribes were very closely associated with the Pharisees.

The Zealots were revolutionaries and were rapidly gaining



followers. Their watch-word was, 'Even tho we be few in number, God is for us--who can be against us. Let us therefore revolt against Rome.'

The Zadokites were a priestly group that accepted both the writings of the prophets and the apocalypticists, and looked for an Aaronic messiah.

These internal quarrels along with the international situation and failure, and the repeated failure of the prophecies of the end of the age led to the thriving of apocalypticism.

### III. Apocalypticism Thrived on the Above Misfortunes

From the return from their exilement in 538 B.C. to the rebellion of Bar Cochba in 135 A.D., Jewish history was a continuous succession of disappointed hopes.<sup>1</sup>

Ezekiel marks the beginning of this apocalyptic tendency when he turns the thought of his people away from the historical interpretation of the Day of Yahweh to a future event.<sup>2</sup>

The failure to achieve the prophetic conception of the Kingdom led to a disappointed hope. The rapid rise and more rapid falling of the Levitic messiahship was a hard blow to their hopes. The failure to find a Davidic King led to more depression and pessimism.

The Pharisees, belonging mainly to the middle and upper classes of society and being fairly comfortable, did not feel keenly the pressure of political oppression and social injustice. It was easy for them to substitute legalism for the prophetic righteousness.

---

1. For detailed treatment see Matthews, A History of New Testament Times in Palestine

2. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 67



.It was from among the lower middle and under classes that the sense of social wrongs and the passion for reform made itself known. The country around the Sea of Galilee seemed very prosperous in Jesus' day. It was out of the labor and hovels of the poor and their sweated labor that the created appearance of prosperity came. One could span the rooms in their dwellings with outstretched arms. There was much like our own age of economic maladjustment. Wealth was to be made in the city so they all left the country for the city, except those who had large acreages worked by slaves. The slaves lived in the direst poverty and squalor. The cities had the advantage of doles and attractions. The "am ha aretz" or the people of the land constituted the vast majority of the population. The mass of the population suffered and saw no hope of improvement or escape, only inevitable enslavement.<sup>1</sup> Apocalypticism was the sole way of expressing political and industrial discontent, and also social aspiration. Consequently it is only natural that longings for social justice should seek expression in the only available means.

The movement was a sort of an opiate to those who were suffering under misgovernment or exploited by their fellowmen. 'It held out a promise of an impossible ideal future promised by Yahweh.'<sup>2</sup> These books were the outcome of despair and were written to hearten those who were in despair.

With all of this background in mind, let us now look at our source materials.

- 
1. McCown, Genesis of the Social Gospel, p. 350 ff
  2. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 96





## Chapter IV. Source Materials

I. Paul's writings came the earliest chronologically after the death of Jesus. Paul's writings are practically no help to us because he was primarily interested in the Christ of faith. The Jesus of history is only quoted in non-eschatological sayings, such as 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'.

II. John's gospel is written about 100 A.D. at Ephesus. It is clearly an interpretation of the meaning of the teachings of Jesus for evangelistic, apologetic, and catechetical purposes. It disagrees with the synoptic gospels radically on the length of the ministry and other aspects of Jesus' life. As a philosophical interpretation of the author's appreciation of Jesus it is a classic piece of literature, but when it comes to locating the tradition upon which it is built and which the author has interpreted, we are almost totally at a loss. Again some of the problems that the author faces are distinctly those of the first century organized Christian church at Ephesus, not those of the group of Jesus' followers in Palestine. Therefore so far as I can see this gospel is of no aid to us.

III. In the synoptic gospels we have several different types of material:

### A. The eschatological passages.

When we speak of eschatology today, we mean the doctrine of 'the last things' as it was understood in late Jewish teaching. To really understand this doctrine one should spend much time in tracing the derivation of the eschatological idea and the transformations through which it passed as the individual person and moral conduct gradually came to the foreground in the Jewish religious life. This we have done in part. A more complete treatment may be found in Dr. McCown's



book, "The Promise of His Coming". There one may find an account of the myths upon which the 'Day of Yahweh', which followed immediately upon the 'last times', was based. Also one may there notice the interesting developments that took place in connection with Yahweh's fulfillment of the long looked for Age of Gold. Also a splendid article will be found in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, by the English scholar Charles, on Eschatology. Let us rapidly summarize the background out of which the Enochic 'Son of Man' concept of the Messiah developed.

For centuries the Hebrew people had looked forward to an age of prosperity and political freedom. Some of them became quite pessimistic about even realizing either of these in this world. So far, both the prophetic idea of divine intervention and the Messianic idea of a Davidic or Levitic Messiah had always failed them.

They began to feel that this world was so bad that they could never hope to realize their national reward in it, and so it happened that several centuries before Jesus' time we find the beginning of the idea of an Enochic supernatural Messiah who was to come 'on the clouds of heaven' to judge this wicked world and to set up God's Kingdom.

This apocalyptic idea was the direct antithesis of the three former ideas of the means of bringing about the glad new era for which they longed. This was not Yahweh intervening directly in their behalf, nor was it the Political Davidic Messiah, nor was it the Levitical Messiah, but it was a mediator who came direct from Yahweh 'on the clouds of heaven' to vindicate his people and to inaugurate the new era.

In our New Testament we find instances when Jesus speaks of himself coming back on the clouds of heaven to judge this world and to set



up his kingdom. Further, he tells his disciples that these things will take place very shortly after he has been crucified. In fact, he insists that these things will happen during the lifetime of many who now hear him. These eschatological teachings very closely parallel the teachings of later Judaism on the nature of the last things, the change being that in our New Testament, the central place of apocalyptic eschatology is definitely given to Jesus, as the Messiah, whose descent from heaven is to bring the end of this world, the resurrection of the righteous and the martyrs, the judgment, the Kingdom of God, and everlasting life. Emphasis was laid on the fact that this was all to happen within their own generation. Mk. 9:9.

Some scholars, Case for one, say that Jesus never claimed the Messiahship, and that all of these eschatological teachings are to be attributed to the first century Christians who foisted the Messianic title on Jesus. On these grounds all of eschatological teachings must be thrown out of our gospels if we would know the real Jesus.

Other scholars following Sanday and others, spiritualized or allegorized all of these sayings, thus making Jesus independent of the thought forms of his own time.

Dr. Schweitzer insists that the whole of Jesus' teachings must be interpreted in the light of late Jewish eschatology, that Jesus was a man of his times and was limited strictly to the thought of his time. How then are we to interpret what we find before us in our New Testament? In the first place we must not be so unfair as to expect the New Testament and Jesus to speak to us in the ideal forms and thought patterns of our own day.

If one were to desire to impersonate Napoleon in a play it







would be necessary to study not only Napoleon's personal character, but the time in which he lived with all of its economic, political, national, and religious movements. Then having this information one could make Napoleon real to an audience. The same thing is true of understanding Jesus' use of eschatology. Jesus lived in an age when the apocalyptic conception of the future kingdom was very strong. Just a very little time spent with Burton's, The Teachings of Jesus, (a source book), will convince one that many of the people of later Judaism believed that their peace, prosperity, and freedom was to come only through Divine intervention which was to come soon and transform this evil age into a new era of good life for them.

This being true it is not at all unnatural to have Jesus using the thought forms of his day in expressing himself.

Having stated that Jesus used eschatology let me proceed to prove my point.

The multitudes whom Jesus addressed, the disciples whom he chose, knew only the world view of the apocalypticist. There were no categories in which Jews could think, no language they could use in reference to the reform of society but those of apocalypticism. It was the one medium Jesus could use to present his message to his age.

The prominence of the eschatological element in the teachings of Jesus would call for no emphasis were it not for the fact that we are so thoroughly steeped in a scientific background. No one can deny that the Kingdom of God was the central theme of Jesus. His preaching begins with it. "The time has now come, God's reign is near, repent and believe in the gospel". (Mk. 1:15) Most of his parables are introduced by the



phrase, "The Kingdom of God is like unto...." The first petition of the model prayer is "Thy Kingdom come". The superscription on the cross was "The King of the Jews". Again one cannot deny that he used the language of the Jewish apocalyptist. The Son of Man is to come "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels". (Mk.8:38) To the high priest Jesus said, "You will all see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven". (Mk. 14:62--see Ln. 62:5) It is not something in the far distant future to which he refers. "This adulterous and sinful generation"--it is a thoroughly apocalyptic phrase he uses--will soon be startled out of its indifference. "I tell you truly", said Jesus to his disciples, "there are some of those standing here who will not taste death till they see the coming of God's reign with power." (Mk. 9:1) Referring to various apocalyptic predictions he said, "I tell you truly the present generation will not pass away till all this happens." (Mk. 13:30) The disciples were exhorted, "Take care, keep awake and pray, you never know the time." (Mk. 13:33) The Son of Man was to come as suddenly as the lightening, as unexpectedly as a thief in the night or the flood in the days of Noah. (1)"<sup>2</sup>

Von Dobschutz says, "There is a large enough genuine stock of eschatological sayings of Jesus to prove that he himself believed in a change of all things which would come quickly, and not later than the end of his own generation; the Kingdom of God would than be established in full glory and happiness by his own coming in power and glory." <sup>3</sup>

The gospels introduced two new points to eschatology:

---

1. Mt. 24:26f, Lk. 17:23f, Mt. 24:43, 37, Lk 12:39, 17:26 f
2. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, pp 154-5
3. Von Dobschutz, Eschatology of the Gospels, p. 123 f



1. The central place is given to Jesus whose Parousia from heaven in the glory of the Father was to bring with it the end of the world, the resurrection, the judgment, the Kingdom of God, and life everlasting.

2. This was expected to happen very speedily. The messiah having been sent ahead by God in the person of Jesus the end was postponed for a short time only.

The early Christians were persuaded that this promise would come in their own generation. Jesus, his disciples, and Paul shared this opinion.<sup>1</sup>

Jesus on various occasions insisted on the coming of the Kingdom. (Mk. 9:9, Mt. 6:10). Paul believed that the kingdom was coming during his generation. (I Thes. 4:15, 17; I Cor. 1:51, 52) (Later Paul's attitude changed, II Cor. 5:6-8, and individual death takes the place of the Parousia. Phil. 3:20, Rom. 13:11-12. However, Paul still believed that the event was near at hand.)

Jesus believed that the gospel should be preached to all nations before the Kingdom came. (Mk. 13:10) Yet there is no evidence there is no evidence that he dreamed of hastening the end by his activity and suffering.<sup>2</sup> Jesus looked forward to a rich harvest, which was to be given to the poor, hungry, merciful, and pure in heart. (Mt. 5:3-12, Lk. 6:2-22)

The Kingdom was to come soon and the disciples must be watchful. (Mt. 24:41-49)

When we try to get at the meaning of these sayings we must remember that they were a part of the world view of that time. These

1. Mt. 10:23; 16:28; 24:34, Mk 7:28, I Thes. 14:15, 17, I Cor. 15:51, 52  
2. von Dobschuetz, Eschatology of the Gospels, Introduction





eschatological-apocalyptic prophecies of Jesus are to be understood from the point of view of his Jewish conceptions, without regard for their fulfillment. Additions to Jesus Eschatology.

We must proceed with care as we interpret these passages, as some of them are coloured by eschatological additions and changes. Let us look at a few of these.

1. In the saying, "Lord, lord", (Mt. 7:21 and Lk. 6:46) Luke has the original form. Lk. "And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?", is not eschatological. Mt. "Not every one that says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven", is eschatological. The priority of Luke is supported by the parable in Q of the house built upon rock or upon sand, a moral parable. Also by Mk. 3:35 and parallels, "For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister and mother".

2. Again we see a transformation in the parables of the tares and the net. Mt. adds verses 41-43 as an interpretation connected with the last judgment. Taken by themselves, the parables describe the daily incidents of fishing and sowing.

3. The Marcan Apocalypse (Mk. 13; Mt. 24; Lk. 21) and its parallels is another example. This is a composite work mixing the original sayings of Jesus with parts of a little apocalypse. The clue that led to the discovery and formulation of the conclusion that this is an early Christian Fly Sheet, lies in the description of the world as getting worse and worse, and the signs of the latter times being fulfilled. These ideas directly contradict the main body of Jesus' teaching that there shall be no signs,



and that both he and his disciples are overcoming evil.<sup>1</sup> Verses 7, 8, 14-29, 24-27 were without a doubt not the teachings of Jesus as they describe the above ideas. Some authorities include verses 28, 29 in this grouping also. This is distinctly an apocalyptic addition to Jesus' ideas.

B. Some eschatological utterances of Jesus are changed into historical predictions.

1. Jesus' saying in regard to Jerusalem, taken from Q, both in Matthew 23: 37-39 and Luke 13:34-35, closes with these words, "And I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Luke places the saying long before the entrance to Jerusalem as a prediction of the Messianic entrance. Matthew records it in an eschatological sense, and is probably right.

2. This is also well illustrated in Lk. 21:20, a rendition of Mk. 13 in which Lk. substitutes historical prediction for obscure eschatological prophecy. "But when ye see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand."

Thus it is possible that a number of these eschatological sayings have either been added to or cut to suit the need at hand.

### C. Assured Eschatological Material

1. The Kingdom of God in its origin is undoubtedly eschatological. To Jesus the Kingdom is synonymous with a new era--in which God reigns without any opposition either by man or evil spirits. (Mk. 1:15; Mt. 4:17) To Jesus the Kingdom is a new order that will be realized by an act of God. God does not reign absolutely in this world.<sup>2</sup> But, "The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand!"

---

1. Moffatt, The Introduction to the New Testament, p.207

2. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p. 563



In Mat. 6:10, "Thy kingdom come", Jesus teaches his disciples to pray for a kingdom that is to come. The next verse, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth, " shows the kingdom to be a state of manking in which God's will is done.

2. What was the relation of Jesus to this kingdom? Jesus calls himself the 'Son of Man', he never claims directly in his teaching that he is the Messiah, and he declines to be called the 'Son of David'. Yet his apperance, the way he manifests himself in the authoritative tone that he adopts, leads people to follow him as the messiah.<sup>1</sup>

When the High Priest asked him, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the blessed?" Jesus answered, "I am, and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven." (Mk. 14:61, 62 cp. Mt. 26:64) In both of these references Jesus clearly claims the Messiahship.

Nor does he think of himself as the Messiah only of the future. The High Priest tried him as making present claims, Pilate tried him on the same charge, and the title on the cross is by itself a convincing argument that Jesus did claim to be the Messiah.

3. Not only did Jesus claim to be the Messiah. He speaks of his coming again in power and glory.

When speaking about the necessity of confession he says, "For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in the adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mk. 8:38 cp Mt. 26:27)

---

1. von Dobschuetz, Eschatology of the Gospels, p. 97





The warnings of false Messiahs presuppose His coming again.  
(Mk. 13:6, 21; Lk. 17:23, 24; Mt. 24:23-28)

When James and John ask for the chief places in the Kingdom, Jesus does not reject the notion but says that only the Father has the right to bestow these places. (Mk. 10:35-40; Mt. 20:20-23)

There are also many parables dealing with the unexpected return of Jesus. Mk. 13:33-37 gives only short extracts of what must have been a much larger tradition.

#### 4. Eschatological Material in Q.

Not only Mk. but Q, and other Non-Markan sources reveal eschatology.

In Lk. 12:9 and Mt. 10:33 we read, "He that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God". (Mt. "before my Father which is in heaven!")

Branscomb cites from Q Mt. 8:11 and Lk. 13:29 on the future of the kingdom.

Eschatology is to be found in (Mt. 23:39, Lk. 13:35) Jesus' woes over Jerusalem, "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye say: Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord"; in the admonition for readiness (Mt. 24:44; Lk. 12:40); the coming of the Son of Man is to be like lightning (Mt. 24:27; Lk. 27:24); promise made to disciples Mt. 19:28.

5. The impression made by these, and other passages that may be found in the Synoptics, is that the coming of Jesus is to be a miraculous, supernatural, but at the same time external and visible event in history, --- a catastrophe to be looked for at the end of this age.

6. The spiritualizing tendency of modern theology has tried to



escape eschatology by dealing with each passage by itself. That is to say by making one after another of these passages say what they want it to say the interpreters are able to declare that there is no eschatology. Thus as, Haupt says of this passage, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven," --- How can they see him sitting at the right hand of power? This can be meant only in a spiritual way: they shall see his influence in the propagation of his gospel, and his next sentence is but another allusion to the same idea: they will see his influence in the judgment passed on their own people for having rejected him.<sup>1</sup>

These eschatological passages have a cumulative effect which can not be explained away by making them individually say what we want them to, either through spiritualization or allegorization.

When Jesus said, "Ye shall see", he meant the judges themselves and their children, not later generations. The present generation is destined to see the end of history. Mk. 13:30; Mt. 24:34; Lk. 21:32. 'Verily I say unto you: this generation shall not pass away, until all these things are accomplished."

In another reference (Mk. 9:1; Mt. 16:28; Lk. 9:27) we have, "Verily I say unto you: There be some here of them that stand by which shall in no wise taste of Death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power." This clearly means that some of those now living will witness the coming of the Kingdom.

Thus we can see clearly that Jesus did use eschatology in his teaching, that he himself believed in a change that would come quickly and in his own generation; that the kingdom would be established

---

1. von Dobschuetz, Eschatology of the Gospels, p. 108.



in its full glory and happiness by his own coming in power and glory.

Jesus was not interested in the details of eschatology.

"For Jesus' eschatology has only a two-fold significance.

(1) It helps him to understand and make men understand his own position, being the Messiah, the culmination of God's revelation to his people, find in all that he says and does. He announces the Dominion of the Kingdom of God over evil. (2) It is a motive in his admonition: be ready, be watchful, because the Kingdom of God is at hand.<sup>1</sup>"

### Transmuted Eschatology

But beside these there is another set of sayings dealing with the Kingdom and the Messiah showing the Kingdom to be present, and Jesus the Messiah bringing salvation.

In the two parables of Mk. 3:24-27, Jesus argues that in casting out devils he proves the power of the Kingdom to be present and working through him. This is a new notion of the meaning of the Kingdom: that God's power is at present overcoming the evil of the world.

Here Jesus is a bit inconsistent in his eschatology in that the new age has already begun by God's power being present and that in the immediate future its final consummation shall come. He does not depend completely on catastrophies to bring the power of God into the world.

Also, he does not only think of himself as the Messiah of the future. The power of God is working through him now. Later on we see the Priests and Pilate trying him on the charge of being the present Messiah.

Speaking to the Pharisees, Jesus said, "The Kingdom of God comes not with observation --- the Kingdom of God is within or among you. cp. Mk. 7:15,21; Mt. 13:11,19, where Jesus says that evil exercises its

---  
1. von Dobschuetz, Eschatology of the Gospels, p. 124.





dominion in man's heart and in society and that the Kingdom of God is established in man's heart and in society as it drives evil out.

Along this same line of thought Bundy speaks of the Kingdom as a supernatural thing, the work of God, but it is to be realized among men by casting evil out of their lives. Mt. 12:28.<sup>1</sup>

Branscomb, in speaking of Jesus in warning his disciples not to look for signs, but to "turn their attention to the Kingdom of the heart," quotes Mk. 13:32.<sup>2</sup>

Goguel feels that the Aramaic equivalent of  $\text{ܡܠܟܘܬܐ}$  can be translated either as in the present or in the future and in choosing the latter renders it, "the possibility of entering the Kingdom lies within you in the future."<sup>3</sup>

I prefer von Dobschuetz solution that Jesus was speaking of the Kingdom as being present on the grounds that the other sayings that describe the Kingdom as being present would not be translatable in the above names suggested by Goguel.

All of these men interpret Jesus as referring to a present Kingdom.

3. In Mt. 19:12,13, and Lk. 16:16, we have the time of Jesus set in opposition to the time of John, the present to the past, and it is to the present that the Kingdom belongs, not to the future.

4. In Mk. 10:15, and Lk. 18:17, "Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God, as a little child, he shall in no wise enter in." Here we have Jesus describing the Kingdom as a present social and religious experience accessible to man in the present time.

---

1. Bundy, The Religion of Jesus, p. 154; p. 150; p. 130.

2. Branscomb, The Teachings of Jesus, P. 141.

3. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p. 567,568.



5. In the parable of the mustard seed and leaven, Mk. 4:30-32; Lk. 13:18-21; Mt. 13:31-33, the notion of the Kingdom is the opposite of the eschatological one which makes the Kingdom appear suddenly in full power and glory. Here we are told that it grows up quickly through preach-<sup>1</sup>ing, teaching and healing. Note: Jesus' opinion has nothing in common with the modern view of gradual evolution of the Kingdom. He thinks of a rapid growing and quick leavening of the whole people by his gospel. Through his preaching the Kingdom is present --- an inner experience.

"Jesus' message was one of faith and hope, not despair; of glad tidings of a power of good already at work in the world in human lives, a power like the subtle working of leaven, to whose quiet inconspicuous working would be due the real accomplishment whereof the Dramatic<sup>2</sup> Day of Yahweh would be little more than the manifestation."

Denny (p. 142). Branscomb (p. 139) and von Dobschuetz (p. 2) as well as the others cited agree that Jesus did not hold the evolutionary conception of gradual development of the Kingdom, rather of rapid growth. B. This notion of the Kingdom as a present inward experience is supported by sayings in which Jesus looks upon himself as bringing present salvation to his people."

1. When John the Baptist sent to Jesus and asked, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" Jesus refers John to his activity as a fulfillment of the requirements of salvation. (Lk. 7:19; Mt. 11:3).

"Jesus was not a pessimist. He saw God at work in the world saving men and destroying evil of all sorts." (2) "The religious aspect of the Kingdom need not wait until the end of the present age. Each individual could enter the Kingdom here and now, make God's rule actual and present

---

1. von Dobschuetz, *Eschatology of the Gospels*, p. 126.

2. Bacon, *The Son of Man Usage*. Journal Biblical Literature, 1921, '22, p. 143.



in his own life. Jesus endeavored to bring men into the Kingdom: he was its founder as well as its herald. His ministry was bringing victory over evil powers and making the Kingdom a present Reality.<sup>1</sup> Denny sees primarily in Jesus' conception of the Kingdom an inward spiritual relation between man and God that was to bring salvation.<sup>2</sup>

The temptation experience interpreted eschatologically, shows Jesus through the living as a 'Suffering Servant' bringing the way of life that led to individual, national and international salvation.<sup>3</sup> Jesus' conception of the Kingdom had no political reference. But the imminence of the Kingdom meant the collapse of the earthly empires. The Kingdom was the fulfillment of the will of God --- Not divine power placed at the service and hatred of the Jewish people.<sup>4</sup>

2. And his disciples understood that he was bringing them this present salvation. At times when the majority of the people didn't know whether he was a rabbi, prophet, or John the Baptist. Peter declared him the Messiah, the unique bringer of salvation. Jesus didn't decline this title (see Mk. 3:27ff) but forbade his disciples to tell the people fearing that it would stir up false hopes for a political revolt.

3. Jesus fulfilled all the things that were expected in the messianic times.

A. Lk. 12:51-53; Mt. 10:34-35: (in Q) Reveal the mutual hatred of the last times, even in his family (Mk. 3:21,31ff; cp. Mt. 12:46ff; Lk. 8:19ff; Lk. 15:52ff).

---

1. Branscomb, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 139.

Branscomb, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 137, 138, 143.

2. Denny, The Career and Significance, Y.J. p. 143.

3. McDowd, The Temptations of Jesus Eschatologically and Socially Interpreted  
Biblical World LIII July 1919.

4. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p. 569.





B. Mt. 24:40-41; Lk. 17:34. (Q) Jesus brings sharp separation between men calling some to follow him and leaving others.

C. At the messianic time a large festival was expected. In Lk. 14:16-24 and Mt. 22:1-14, Jesus speaks of being invited. The heathens eat with the patriarchs (Lk. 13:28ff; Mt. 8:11ff).

4. All these things paint the same effect: that Jesus is the Messiah in the sense that he brings present judgment and salvation. Jesus surrounded by his disciples represent the new era of messianic time.

The above evidence shows that we have in the teachings of Jesus what von Dobschuetz calls transmuted eschatology. Transmuted in the sense that what was to take place in the last days is taken here as already at hand in the life and time of Jesus, also in that what was expected as an outward external change is taken inwardly and spiritually.

"A brief review of the story of the temptation in the wilderness will confirm our position. If we can depend upon the chronological position of this story we find that it stands at the beginning of Jesus' ministry and that it is an interpretation of his purpose. He had just come from his baptism with the certain consciousness that he was to fulfill ancient prophecy and usher in the reign of God. What sort of a Kingdom was it to be? First, he rejects the conception widely current among the people that it was to be principally meat and drink. He had not to inaugurate a period of paradisaical plenty, where men could eat without effort. He would not experiment with turning stones into bread that he might later win a following from the multitude. Second, following the Lucan order, he had not come to reestablish the Davidic Kingdom. He had no sympathy with the aims or methods of the Zealots. The subjugation of the kingdoms of this world was not synonymous the establishment of God's reign. Finally, he rejected



the idea of catastrophic intervention from heaven, with an Enochic messiah of the clouds whose angel should overcome the resistance of the wicked and the inertia of the indifferent: and, whether man would or no, set the position of completely rejecting the ideals and hopes of apocalypticism and of being entirely out of sympathy with their views of God, the universe<sup>1</sup> and the future.

Let us now notice these two distinct group of teachings: eschatological and transmuted eschatological. Both groups are distinct and must be kept separate. Both, as we have seen, occur in both Mark and Q. Neither of them may be reduced to the other without doing violence to the tradition.

#### Non-eschatological Materials

Taking all eschatological and transmuted-eschatological materials together we find that they represent only a small part of the total gospel tradition. The non-eschatological sayings are about trust in God,<sup>2</sup> God's care for the individual,<sup>3</sup> prayer,<sup>4</sup> and the certainty of being heard;<sup>5</sup> not trusting riches,<sup>6</sup> loving ones neighbor,<sup>7</sup> loving ones enemies,<sup>8</sup> pardoning offenders<sup>9</sup> and etc. The great value of Q is that it represents Jesus from this side. We have plenty of this non-eschatological and purely moral matter in Mark, e.g., Jesus sayings about cleanliness (7:1-23), marriage and divorce (10:1-12), children (10:13-16), and the rich (10:17-31).

In the doublet sayings related by both Mark and Q we find that these non-eschatological sayings had a wide circulation. Out of thirty of these doublets that Burkitt chooses only seven are eschatological.

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 150f.
2. Mt. 6:19-34; 3. Lk. 15:1-7; 4. Mt. 6:5-13; 5. Mt. 7:7-11; 6. Mt. 6:19-21; 7. Lk. 10:25-37; 8. Mt. 5:49; 9. Lk. 6:41-42, Mt. 6:14, and etc.



If we had no knowledge of eschatology we would be able to understand these. Jesus personally was interested in the moral and spiritual aspects of life toward which his transmuted and non-eschatological teachings direct us.

This is where we are forced to take issue with Schweitzer and all thorough going eschatologistic again. The theory of consistent eschatology can only be maintained by doing violence to the tradition which contains transmuted and non-eschatological material. It does violence to Jesus' moral teaching by subordinating it to His announcement of the approaching end and calling it interim ethic. If Jesus' teaching were all eschatology, how does it happen that the church has lived all these ages without much emphasis on eschatology?





## Chapter V. Jesus' Use of Apocalypticism and Eschatology.

To the average Christian of today there is generally a complete lack of sympathy with and a misunderstanding of those sections of our N.T. that deal with apocalypticism and eschatology. One factor that contributes to this situation is the lack of an historical appreciation of Jewish use of apocalypticism and eschatology.

Another factor is the use and abuse that many 'isms make of their millennial predictions. After people have become accustomed to these predictions, as the true teachings of the Bible, and when they find that experience proves these teachings not to be the truth, they naturally come to the conclusion that much of the Biblical, especially N.T., materials is not true.

These factors led people to believe that Jesus could not have been an apocalypticist or an eschatologist. With some who did not wish to say that these passages were not capable of edification there developed the tendency to see esoteric meanings and to spiritualise them. Scholars, judging Jesus on the basis of what they would expect of men of today simply said that these were later additions of Jesus' followers. But if Jesus did not use the language of apocalypticism we find it necessary to eliminate large and important sections of the synoptic gospels as unauthentic interpolations of early Christians. This would force us to believe that Jesus lived and died outside the thought life that was characteristic of his time.

The general conception of history held by the Jewish people, that they were living in the end of the old era and that soon a new era of peace and prosperity was to come, would naturally leave its mark on Jesus thinking. It was their philosophy of history and conception of the nature of the universe.



The fact that the cannon had been closed about two hundred B.C. meant that all natural sources of criticism of their contemporary life and natural sources of protest were closed.

The apocalyptic writings were the only means of expressing political and industrial discontent as well as expressing social aspiration. And anyone wishing to reform Judaism would have to look for support among those of the apocalyptic spirit, who were keenly sensitive to the needs and suffering of their people. "He would be forced to find in the conceptions and ideas of apocalypticism the means for interpreting his own ideals to his people."

Just as we believe in heliocentricity as contrasted with geocentricity as our contemporary interpretation of the relation of our earth to the sun and the planets, so did Jesus hold certain world views that were limited by the science and thinking of his time. Just as he found it necessary to use Greek and Roman coins, so did he find it necessary to use the language and the thought forms of his day. There were no other means available with which he might express the moral and religious ideals that he was trying to convey.

Thus it was that while apocalypticism was a retrogressive movement from the teachings of the prophets that it was the only means Jesus had of beginning to make himself understood. "The multitude whom Jesus addressed, the disciples whom he chose, knew only the world view of the apocalypticist. There were no categories in which Jews could think, there was no language they could use in reference to the reform of society but those of apocalypticism. It was the one medium Jesus could use<sup>1</sup> in presenting his message to his age."

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, pp. 153, 154.



The only ones that had an appealing solution to the religious, political, and social problems of Jesus' day were the Zealots who promised immediate release from Rome, and the righting of all internal wrongs. They advocated direct action and, like many of today who are suffering and have nothing to loose and everything to gain, there were many in their desperation that were ready to take any step toward release.

The Pharisees with their legalism and the Sadducees with their opportunism belonged to the upper middle class and were fairly comfortable . They were therefore indifferent to the wrongs under which the majority of the people were suffering. Their indifferentism made the people follow those who at least suggested a way out--- no matter how faulty that way might be.

"To the clear mind of Jesus it was evident that disaster lay ahead, unless some radically new, constructive program could capture the mind of the rank and file of the nation. There was need for something as attractive and inspiring as the fanaticism of the Zealots, with their promise of immediate emancipation from the servitude of Rome and the thorough righting of all wrongs, something that would counteract the legalism<sup>1</sup> of the Pharisees and reform the abuses of the Sadducees."

Jesus had no sympathy with the Sadducees in their refusal of both the apocalyptical and prophetic teachings and their opportunism. He did not sympathize with the Scribes and Pharisees in their meticulous emphasis on the technicalities of the law which put the clever interpretation of the letter of the law above the very reason for its being, the spirit of the law. This was the reason why Jesus likened the Scribes and Pharisees to their fathers of old who killed the prophets. In their substitution of legalism for righteousness, they were entirely indifferent

---







to the social wrongs and the religious needs of their people. Indeed, they made religion a hindrance rather than an aid.

Even though Jesus did not agree with the orthodox position of his people yet he was not a thoroughgoing apocalypticist. Apocalypticism was intensely nationalistic. Israel was supreme and superior to any and all nations. It was based on certain divine intervention on their part. It longed for the overthrow of the rich and mighty and the elevation of the poor and weak. "Here then was the promise of a real solution of the whole complicated series of problems which the nation faced. Its political future was assured; evil and irreligion were to be miraculously overthrown; want and injustice were to come to an end. This solution did not appeal to the Sadducees, perhaps not to the majority of the Pharisees, for they belonged to the rich, the proud, the mighty who were to be overthrown or else expected the reign of God to be introduced in some other manner. But it did attract the multitude. Properly understood it was quietistic. Man was to wait for God to act by his won might and in his own time. But the apocalypticist was convinced by his reading the sign of the times that the hour of destiny was at hand. Many and various as were the types of apocalyptic thought, their total effect was to increase tension, to embitter class and racial feeling, and to make any rational solution of the different problems of the nation unacceptable. It was pessimistic. It was a flight from reality into the lands of dreams. It could bring temporary forgetfulness of pain, but in the end it made the disease worse."

The apocalyptic world view was pessimistic, deterministic, mechanical, external, and literalistic. Jesus held none of these conceptions. He acknowledged the difficulties of discipleship, but his world

---

1  
McCowan, Genesis of the Social Gospel, p. 320.



was a friendly one (not evil and growing worse and worse) and his world ministered to man's needs without respecting persons. His world was ruled by a loving heavenly father. Righteousness was not an externally imposed experience but a personal and social experience gained through human participation in God's work. Matter was not inherently evil. Jesus was not literalistic. He went back of the letter of the letter of the Old Testament to the spirit of it. He condemned the hater as well as the murderer.

"Can one suppose for a moment that Jesus so valued the letter of the prophecy that he would have insisted that it must all be fulfilled in detail as the apocalyptist insisted? Certainly no word of his gives any basis for such a supposition and the spirit of his teaching points in exactly the opposite direction.

Over against the thoroughgoing autocracy and externalism of the apocalyptic world view, he put a thoroughgoing spiritual democracy. No kind of compulsion could make men good. Signs and miracles as such he utterly rejected:

'If they will not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be convinced, not even if one raise from the dead.' Lk. 16:31.

'Why does this generation demand a Sign? I tell you truly no sign will be given to this generation'. Mk. 8: 12.

Such language is fundamentally inconsistent with the expectation of the conversion of the world into the kingdom of God by a cosmic catastrophe or<sup>1</sup> the appearance of the messiah of the clouds."

As inadequate as it was, Jesus had to make use of apocalypticism as the best available, and possibly the only, means of bringing his message to his people. It was necessary for Jesus to do the same thing

---

1. McCowan, The Promise of His Coming, p. 147.



that the prophets before him had done. They took the Hebrew national hope of the day of Yahweh and put into it historical, social, ethical, and spiritual content. Jesus took over the pessimistic retrogressive apocalypticism and put historical, moral, social, and spiritual content into it.

Thus it was that Jesus took up the message of John the Baptist ---the nearness of the Kingdom of God. As time went on the content of the Kingdom and the Messiah were slowly changed so that apocalypticism became<sup>1</sup> the form in which Jesus' moral and spiritual teachings were clothed.

In the following summary we see the moral and spiritual effect on apocalyptic eschatological ideas. This summary is based on the excised Marcan apocalypse and on other passages in Mark and it shows Jesus to be very much at home in the use of apocalyptic:

1. Persecution and suffering are to be the lot of his disciples for a time; vindication and reward are to follow. "Look to yourselves ..... "You will be hated by all men on account of my name but he will be saved who holds out to the very end." (Mk 13:9-13)

2. He is the Son of Man, now preaching and healing, and suffering; eventually to return in divine power to inaugurate the Kingdom of God in its full manifestation. (Mk 8:21, 9:1)

3. False prophets will continually arise to proclaim the nearness of his advent for this purpose (Mk 13:5f, 21:23; Lk 17:20-23), but they will invariably be mistaken, for he will appear suddenly and unexpectedly; no one can tell the time in advance.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Scott, The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Mind of Jesus, p. 141.

Journal of Biblical Literature, Vols. 40-41, 1921-1922.

<sup>2</sup> Mk 13:32; Mt 24:37ff; Lk 17:26-29; Mt 24:26f; Lk 17:23f.







4. Yet he is to come very soon, within the life time of his contemporaries. (Mk 13:30; 9:1; 14:25,62)

5. He will come in glory, on the clouds, with the angels, sitting at the right hand of power, thus combining the ideal human messiah of the Psalms of Solomon with the supernatural Son of Man of Enoch, the first in his present earthly life, the second in the age to come. (Mk 8:38; 14:62)

6. His coming will bring judgment, purely on moral lines.<sup>1</sup>  
(Mk 13:33-37; Mt 24:42-51; Lk 12:39-46; Mt 25:1-46; etc.)

But Jesus carries the prophetic moral and spiritual more deeply into his use of apocalyptic-eschatology. In Chapter IV under the Teachings of Jesus, we spent some time on his Transmuted Eschatology. The outstanding characteristics of these teachings were: 1. that the things that were to take place in the last days were taken as present, 2. that what was to be taken as external and cataclysmic was to be an inward present experience. We need only refer to the temptation narrative as we explained it from the standpoint of transmuted eschatology to see how very much the social, moral, and spiritual overshadows the form in which it is cast. Once we get the fact firmly set in our minds that Jesus used the forms of apocalypticism and put new moral and spiritual content into them, we can readily see how it was possible for him to take the pessimistic, deterministic, and retrogressive apocalypticism and make of it an instrument by which he spreads his message.

This is what I believe to be a mistake in the work of Denny in his "Career and Significance of Jesus". Both in the introduction and his statement about the 'Teaching Source' or Q, Denny maintains that Q

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, pp. 157, 158.



portrays Jesus as a religious Son of God, not in an apocalyptic, or even a Messianic sense. "Since the ruling idea of apocalyptic teaching is that God is not a Forgiving Father, but an Unforgiving Avenger, we can not believe that Jesus shared this current view; rather, he spent his life protesting against it. The apocalyptic ideas attributed to Jesus in the Gospels are, we hold, read back into his real history by the early Christians, who were neither so simple nor so great as he was, and who were themselves ardent apocalyptists."<sup>1</sup> "This document (Q) has little interest or belief in the doctrine of Jesus' Messiahship . . . It sees Jesus as the Suffering Servant of Yahweh."<sup>2</sup>

In our discussion of Jesus' eschatological and transmuted-eschatological teachings, we saw very clearly that Q contains both eschatological and transmuted-eschatological teachings about Jesus as the Messianic Son of Man. Denny sees so plainly the moral and spiritual in Jesus' teachings, which is the universal, that he lifts Jesus out of the thought patterns of his time by denying that Jesus was even influenced by apocalypticism. He does not see that apocalyptic-eschatology is the form in which Jesus couches his message. It is also an open question as to whether one can accept 'Q' before Mark and 'L'.<sup>3</sup> Certainly Mark must also be considered on formulating one's conception of Jesus self-consciousness.

Goguel feels that the thought of Jesus about the Kingdom and himself was eschatological . . . not apocalyptic, his definition of eschatology being: "the present world will be replaced by a new world and

- 
1. Denny, The Career and Significance of Jesus, Introduction p. 13.
  2. Ibid., pp. 19, 20.
  3. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, p. 7.



the transition is to be imminent." He claims that ". . . apocalypticism adds that the coming will take place according to a prearranged plan which can be known and is revealed by a study of tradition and prophecy. It is possible to calculate in advance with precision, the successive phases of the great drama so that it will be possible to follow its developments." <sup>1</sup>

Here, again, our study of Jesus' use of eschatology and transmuted-eschatology shows us that to an extent Jesus did use eschatology. Jesus did speak of himself as the Son of Man who was to return on the clouds of heaven, he spoke of the Kingdom being at hand and he used other characteristic apocalyptic teachings, but we must notice that the transmuted sense in which he used them must guide us in understanding his non-transmuted use of them. The spirit of what Goguel says is right but if we follow him to the letter we must deny the sources put before us as trustworthy teachings of Jesus.

In conclusion, let us recall that as we saw in the section on transmuted-eschatology Jesus is not consistent in his use of apocalyptic-eschatology. He speaks of the future reign of God. In certain important aspects the reign of God has already begun. He introduces the moral and ethical standards by which men are to live. In him the powers of the Kingdom are already present dominating evil. What was to take place in the last days is already taking place in his life. What was to be an external change is now taking place as a spiritual and social change. <sup>2</sup>

"Those who do not believe that Jesus ever used and intended literally such language as we find ascribed to him overlook the unique-

---

<sup>1</sup>  
Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, p. 569f.

<sup>2</sup>  
von Dobschuetz, *Eschatology of the Gospels*, pp. 127, 149.







ness and incomprehensibility of genius. They make him say and do what they feel they have done under similar circumstances. No great leader of men does under great strain of conflict, when world issues are at stake what a philosophically minded student would do at his study table after long deliberation. Jesus has moved the world far more than any other man. Can we restrict him to the language and thoughts of which we are capable? The uniqueness of Jesus demanded unique expression."<sup>1</sup>

Jesus, then, used apocalyptic-eschatology because it was apparently the only means of appealing to his people. But he put new content into his use of it. He followed in the footsteps of the prophets in that his teachings were primarily spiritual and social.

---

McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 160.



## Chapter VI. Jesus' Use of the Term, Son of Man.

In the last chapter we discussed Jesus' proclamation of the imminent coming of the Kingdom and the advent of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven. He also spoke of a great social reversal when the first should be last. When he was quizzed before the High Priest, he acknowledged that he was the Christ or the looked-for Messiah. (Mk 14: 61) When before Pilate, he admitted that he was the King of the Jews. (Mk 15:2)

What did he mean by allowing himself to be called the Messiah and by announcing the Kingdom?

The people were looking for the overthrow of Rome and the establishing of Jewish political supremacy throughout the world. They were expecting the annihilation of evildoers and of evil from within their nation. They were expecting a great social transition in which there should be no more rich and poor, a day in which their Messiah would reign in abundance and in righteousness. Their hope was a combination of the old prophetic morality and the peace and plenty of the old conception of the day of Yahweh. (See chapter on Hebrew Backgrounds.)

But Jesus didn't fall in entirely with their hopes. He urged, not revolt, but non-resistant righteousness and the payment of tribute to Caesar. In the temptation experience, he acknowledges that man can not live without bread but insists that man shall not live "by bread alone". While he refused to make "plenty" the primary objective of his Kingdom, he insisted that there should be a great social change in which there would be a "leveling up" process. He refused the Son of David militaristic conquest as having nothing to do with his way of achieving the King-



dom. What then was his attitude and program?

Did the term  $\delta \upsilon \acute{\iota} \omicron \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omicron \upsilon$  or  $\text{D T X 12}$

the Danielic and Enochich term have any meaning for Jesus' day? Our first positive answer comes from Dalman in his "Words of Jesus". Dalman maintains that Jesus could have been understood if he had used this term to describe him in the sense of Daniel 7:13.<sup>1</sup>

Our best authority, however, is to be found in the two volume work of Charles, "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament". These documents were current literature just previous to, during, and after Jesus' life. And the conception which these books contain would be known by his people. That means that they would have been as familiar with the Enochic Son of Man (a pre-existent, heavenly Son of Man) as they were with the Danielic representative of Israel. Especially in the books Ezra and Enoch do we find many references to the Enochic "Son of Man".<sup>2</sup> Therefore, these ideas would be accessible to the writers of our Gospels, and if they did not use it we will have to eliminate much material from our Synoptic Gospels.<sup>3</sup>

Case's view that Jesus was only a Jewish prophet who proclaimed the coming reign of God by a direct divine act and without the intervention of a Messiah, that Jesus never considered himself as the Messiah, comes fairly close to this position.<sup>4</sup> Both Wrede<sup>5</sup> and Case would have the Messiahship because they did not wish to admit defeat.

In maintaining this position, the above and other scholars

---

1. Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 217.
2. 4Ezra 13:3ff. & etc; 1En. 46:1-3; 48:3-6; 69:27; and etc.
3. McCown, Genesis of the Social Gospel, p. 324.
4. Case, Jesus, a New Biography, p. 362; Jesus thru the Centuries, pp.2,3,4.
5. Wrede, see Schweitzer, Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 326.





agree with Patton in that Jesus never referred to himself as the Messiah. Patton's argument is based largely on the so-called "I" passages and it<sup>1</sup> seems to me that Dalman is a good corrective for his position.

Branscomb in his book, "The Teachings of Jesus", makes Jesus' relation to God purely a religious one so that he does not claim the Messiahship even though the people call him the Messiah. "According to the Synoptics Jesus said nothing of himself as the Messiah, restrained others<sup>2</sup> who wished to make it public and accepted the title of prophet." But meanwhile the consciousness of the disciples that Jesus was really establishing the Kingdom led them to call him the Messiah.<sup>3</sup>

Bundy approaches Jesus' relationship to the Kingdom from the psychological and philosophical side of religion. Jesus' relationship to the Father and his Kingdom lies in his close personal religious relationship to the Father.<sup>4</sup>

Denny to whom we have referred before, feels that "Jesus devoted his life to a great religious movement thru which he hoped his nation might be saved from impending disaster. He was put to death because Jewish officials would not accept his message and program." Jesus called himself the Son of God and he used the term not in an apocalyptic or messianic sense. Jesus as God's Son thought of his life work in terms of<sup>5</sup> the Suffering Servant concept of Isaiah.

- 
1. Patton, Did Jesus Call Himself the Son of Man, Jour. of Rel. Sept.'22.
  2. Branscomb, The Teachings of Jesus, p. 345.
  3. Ibid., p. 355.
  4. Bundy, The Religion of Jesus, pp. 147, 287, 42.
  5. Denny, The Career and Significance of Jesus, pp. 6, 19, 144 & Intro. p. 13.



Goguel states that during the early part of his ministry, Jesus speaks of the coming Kingdom and Messiah as tho he had no personal part to play in their movements.<sup>1</sup> After Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus begins to think of himself as a suffering Messiah. This incident is especially important to Goguel as he says that we have an independent tradition of Peter's confession in John 6:66-69. The Messianic declaration of Jesus is absolutely authentic. It can not have been invented either by Jews or Christians. The former would have been the last to place in the mouth of Jesus words which would justify the claims made by his disciples. The latter, if they had wished to express their faith in a declaration attributed to their master, would not have simply affirmed their expectation of the parousia but would also have expressed their faith in the certainty of the resurrection which was its guarantee."<sup>2</sup>

Speaking of the time when Jesus became conscious of his Messiahship, Goguel says, "It is not possible to know at what precise moment Jesus knew that he was called to be the Son of Man."<sup>3</sup> Speaking of the method Jesus used to gain followers, he says, "The fact that Jesus felt that he was the Messiah caused him to take up the line we see in the Gospels, and, instead of asking men to adopt this, that, or the other system of ideas, or to follow a way of life, he asked them to follow him. (Mk 1:16, 2:14, 8:34.) Jesus' consciousness of being the Son of God is not directly Messianic in character, but it lead to growth of Messianic consciousness. It was his close religious sonsnip that lead him to his

1. Goguel, The Life of Jesus, p. 572.

2. Ibid., p. 509.

3. Ibid., p. 528.



Messianic consciousness."

Branscomb, Bundy, Denny and Goguel seem to me to try to make Jesus too modern in his thought. They have caught the significance of Jesus for our religious life today, but, once again, when we refer to the eschatological and transmuted-eschatological teachings of Jesus in our synoptics we see without a doubt that unless our sources are not trustworthy that Jesus did think of himself in messianic terms.

Bacon has Jesus prophesying the coming of the Son of Man up to the Caesarea Philippi incident, then after Peter's confession thinking of himself as the Son of Man until just before the entry into Jerusalem when Jesus speaks of himself as the Son of David. After his crucifixion,<sup>1</sup> his disciples called him the 'Son of Man'. This does not seem to be true because of the antagonism Jesus had toward the ideals of the Davidic messiahship. When he went into Jerusalem he went to call the people to repentance and righteousness, not to rebellion against Rome.

Scott sees but does not label the transmuted-eschatology of Jesus. "Jesus declared that the Kingdom was future and must come suddenly and miraculously and yet God reigns and is silently working now."<sup>2</sup>

Schweitzer says that it may be held with equally good grounds that Jesus was and that he was not conscious of being the messiah and that in both cases the arguments are drawn from little details in the sources which may be accidental. He adds that in each case the working out of a hypothesis leads to a conclusion which compels the rejection of some of the actual data of the sources; that each view involves violent treatment

---

1. Bacon, The Son of Man in the Usage of Jesus, pp. 148, 146, Journal of Biblical Literature 1921-1922.

2. Scott, The Place of Apocalypticism in the Conception of Jesus, p. 141 (same as above.)







of the text. I believe that I have many scholars with me when I say that Schweitzer must acknowledge that there are teachings which declare the Kingdom to be here in power working inner and social change. There is a transmuted-eschatology as we have seen in the earlier argument of this paper. Schweitzer, in his theory of consistent eschatology, tries to make Jesus entirely subservient to the thought forms of his day. A little thought on our present situation shows one that at one and the same time we have those that are very conservative, those in the middle of the road, and those who are far in advance of their times when it comes to social, political, and economic problems. Further thought also shows us that this latter group is being crucified for its position just as Jesus was crucified for his position.

Why shouldn't Jesus claim the Messiahship? John Hyrcanus, the Levitic priest, and others did. "There is no reason why any Jew who seriously believed himself commissioned to cause the will of God to be done on earth should not interpret his task in these terms. Had he not heard the words, 'Thou art my beloved son in whom I am well pleased' ? If Jesus pondered long over the salvation of his nation, it would be natural to accept the ideal of his people and accept the Messiahship. It would be far more natural for Jesus to have reached this conviction in the strength of his devotion to a supreme task than that his disciples should have evolved the idea after the nation had rejected and crucified him."

I believe that Jesus used the title Son of Man as the best available one to indicate the nature of his messiahship --- a representa-

---

1. Schweitzer, A Quest of the Historical Jesus, p.7, Jour. Bibl. Lit. 1921-1922.

2. McCown, Genesis of the Social Gospel, p. 326.



tive of mankind whom God was to make the Lord of the world. The Son of Man had its advantages over other terms. The term Son of David was connected with political and militaristic methods and in Mk 13:35, Jesus refuses it. Even as defined in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, the Davidic Kingdom would not be consistent with Jesus moral and spiritual ideals. The Son of Man title hadn't been connected with politics or militarism.

Had Jesus used the term messiah he would have declared himself politically against Rome and would have aroused false aspirations on the part of the Zealots and the Zadokites.

It is interesting to notice that he refused to accept the term without changing its content. He refused in the temptation experience, to cast himself down like one coming out of or on the clouds of heaven.

"Evidence is lacking in the Synoptic Gospels for a purely transcendental view of the reign of God. It was not a common view among the Jews. The end of the age was not necessarily the end of the world. The kingdom of heaven does not imply a kingdom in Heaven. Over against the passages that suggest a future transcendental Kingdom (Mk 12:25; 10:30) are others that just as emphatically suggest a kingdom on earth or one in some sense already present (Mt 6:10; Mk 3:24-27, 9:12f.; Lk 7:22)." His kingdom is truly, ". . . a spiritual kingdom, for it is not a matter of material blessings, of earthly government and glory, or of external or physical force." "On the above grounds one may conclude that Jesus expected the reign of God here on earth. His principles of conduct were preparatory  
1  
to a new life here."

---

McCown, The Genesis of the Social Gospel, pp. 327,328.



Using the term Son of Man he threw over the apocalyptic, pessimistic outlook with its materialism and externalism that were connected with it and emphasized the moral and spiritual. He was to inaugurate the age of righteousness as the fulfillment of the hopes of his people.

The title Son of Man is also defined the way in which Jesus was to carry out his work. It appears repeatedly in the Gospels in connection with references to Jesus' service and suffering. (Mk 2:10; Lk 6; 22; 7:34; 9:58; Mk 8:31; 9:12,31; 10:33,45) It seems hardly possible that such constant collocation of the title with these ideas which were Jesus' unique contribution to the idea of the work of the messiah, can be merely accidental. He fills his title with a double meaning of cross and crown. As firmly as Jesus believed in the coming of the reign of God, he believed with equal certainty that it could come only by the method of suffering and service. The path of victory passed over Golgatha. And Jesus freely chose to follow that path. The title embodies the certainty of his faith, the unreservedness of his devotion, the fullness of his courage. He was willing to make the supreme sacrifice in order that God might reign in the hearts of men and the world of human kind.<sup>1</sup>

This phase defines his attitude toward Zealotism and any other conception of the kingdom that was purely external and material. Only divine power could lead men to the course of action that he deemed essential to the coming of the kingdom. He was not planning a revolt against Rome. The kingdom was to be spiritual before it could be social, an internal power before it could bear external fruit. It must win its victories by spiritual forces.

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 164.





"In contradistinction with the easy-going quietism of the Pharisees, Jesus proclaimed the kingdom as the one pearl worth having, the one treasure worth seeking; one should be willing to sacrifice an eye or a hand for it, even life itself. Jesus could not sit down and wait for a far off divine event. The kingdom of God must come by conflict. It is not true that it can come easily, by gradual growth, or by faithful keeping of God's laws. There must be many a conflict with<sup>1</sup> the powers of evil."

2

Here I follow McCown rather closely again. Jesus' self-consciousness, his estimate of his person and his mission, was unique. No other sane human being has been able to use such language of himself as Jesus did. What does his language imply? (1) He felt that he himself--no other--was to realize the age old expectations of his people. He was to inaugurate the reign of God. The voice from heaven at his baptism, "Thou art my beloved son" connoted a unique commission, and consequently, a unique relation to God. Therefore, Jesus did claim to be the messiah. Here I have to part company with Case who thinks that Jesus never thought of himself as the messiah.<sup>3</sup> While it is possible with Warshower and Bosworth to have Jesus gradually becoming aware of his messiahship, yet I believe that they push it too far back toward the end of his life. With Von Dobschutz, McCown, Barton and others, I believe that Jesus was conscious of his messiahship at his baptism and that the temptation experience is symbolic of the struggle thru which Jesus

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 164.

2. Ibid., p. 161 ff.

3. Case, Jesus thru the Centuries, p. 234; Jesus a New Biography, p. 362.



was continually going until he decided just what course he would take in meeting his people's needs. (2) He was not merely a human king of the Davidic line. He was the 'Son of man'--- a relationship to God which no human being had ever claimed. "When one puts the three terms together, Son of God, messiah, and Son of man, all of them titles which Jesus used or accepted as his by right, one must recognize that Jesus made a claim to a unique position in relation to God, man, and history. As the Enochic son of man comes on the clouds of heaven and sits on the throne of judgment and glory, Jesus is to rule and judge. As all evil is to flee before the Son of man and all men are to worship him, so Jesus will eventually triumph. As the Son of man is to win a purely spiritual victory, so also will Jesus. As the Enochic Son of man is second only to God, so Jesus stands above all others as uniquely the 'Son of the Father'. Accepting the term Son of man in its apocalyptic meaning, one is driven to the conclusion that Jesus claimed a relation to God as his Son which can best be described by using the term which all ages have allowed him as his due; he was divine. In the light of Jewish usage the term Son of Man constitutes a higher claim than Son of God. The interpretation of Jesus in the light of apocalypticism reinforces in an unexpected manner the 'orthodox' view of his person.

"The apocalyptic language of Jesus, then, may be said to record his self-consciousness, his faith in himself. Still more truly may it be said to record his faith in God and in man. Without any preliminary of apostacy and degeneration, of tempest and earthquake, of darkened sun and falling stars, his enemies and his own should see him coming on the clouds of heaven. The cause for which he and his little band of despised followers stood, the glad tidings to the poor, the meek, the suffering, deliverance to captives, the opening of blind eyes, should



triumph, and that not in the far distant future, but even within that generation. Those who opposed him with their way of thinking and living should see it. Secrets should be revealed; the inner character of men and movements should be made clear, when the day of his apocalypse, his revealing, should come. Only the language of the apocalypse could express the certainty, the vividness, the overwhelming power of this faith in the heart of Jesus.

"Whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this disloyal and sinful generation, the Son of man will be ashamed of him when he comes in the glory of the Father with the holy angels. I tell you truly" he said to them, "there are some of those standing here who will not taste death till they see the coming of God's reign with power.... You will all see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven. Mk 8:39; 9:1."

Thus we see that just as Jesus put new content into the apocalyptic-eschatology of his day, so did he put new content into the Messianic title 'Son of Man' which he adopted.

(Note: If one wishes a more detailed study of this question, I should suggest that he take the Abingdon Bible Commentary and Peakes Commentary and follow thru the outstanding events in Jesus' life such as his baptism, the temptation, Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, the transfiguration, the triumphal entry, the trial, and the crucifixion. There is not room here to record in detail my own personal convictions. I believe that from the baptism on Jesus saw increasing messianic significance in the major events of his life.)

---

1. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, p. 163.











## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

### BOOKS.

- Bacon, The Gospel of Mark. New Haven, Yale Press, 1925.
- Bacon, The Story of Jesus. N.Y. Century Co., 1926.
- Bosworth, The Life and Teachings of Jesus. N.Y. McMillan, 1929.
- Branscomb, The Teachings of Jesus, Nashville, Tenn., Cokesbury Press, 1931.
- Bundy, The Religion of Jesus. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1928.
- Buoney, The Poetry of Our Lord.
- Burton, The Teachings of Jesus, a Source Book.
- Case, Jesus, a New Biography.
- Case, Jesus thru the Centuries.
- Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. Claredon Press, 1928.
- Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian.
- Charles, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.
- Dalman, The Words of Jesus
- von Dobschuetz, The Eschatology of the Gospels. London, Hodden and  
Stoughton, 1910.
- Easton, The Gospel Before the Gospels. 1928.
- Edersheim, In the Days of Christ.
- Grant, The People of Palestine.
- Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth. 1925.
- Mathews, A History of the New Testament Times in Palestine.
- McCown, C.C. The Promise of His Coming. N.Y. McMillan, 1921
- McCown, C.C. The Genesis of the Social Gospel. N.Y. Knoff, 1929.
- Montefiori, The Synoptic Gospels.
- Cesterly, The Doctrine of the Last Things, London. 1909.



Oesterly & Robinson, Hebrew Religion.

Patton, Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.

Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel.

Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah.

Schweitzer, A Quest for the Historical Jesus. Eng. Trans. by W. Montgomery, London, Charles and Block, 1910.

Streeter, The Four Gospels.

#### Periodicals.

Bacon, "The 'SON of MAN' in the usage of Jesus. Jour. Bibl. Lit. Vol. 40,  
41. 1921-1922.

Bultman, The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem, Jour. Rel. Vol. 6, '26

Scott, The Place of Apocalyptic conceptions in the Mind of Jesus.

Jour. Bibl. Lit. Vols. 40-41, 1921-1922.

Patton, Did Jesus call Himself the Messiah? Jour. Rel., Vol. 2, P. 501.

#### Commentaries

Abingdon Bible Commentary, N.Y., Abingdon Press 1929.

Peakes Commentary of the Bible,. London, T.C. & E.C. Jack Ltd., 1929

Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.





End of

Jesus' conception of his messiahship

This title was preceded by

The relation of the mystical to the moral in religious  
experience

The centrality of the value concept in Christian  
thought

A study of the religious consciousness

And is continued by

The conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees

Search by above titles on [archive.org](https://archive.org) to  
continue reading this collection of Pacific  
School of Religion Theses from 1934  
call number Thesis Cage 1934 v.5

